1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

273

so scared. I don't care what you call it, but I requested Wells Fargo to hire corporate security for that office for at least -- I think they were there for a week where they took me back and forth to my car because I was literally afraid of him at that point. And the thought of having to come here today was really -- was really hard.

Q. Take a minute. I'm going to leave this topic. We're almost done. We're almost done. Take a minute.

It might help you to take a look at

Exhibit 8 in the notebook. Grab a drink of water. And
what I'm going to ask you to do, Mary, is go into the

U5. Take a minute. Take your time. We're almost done.

Get the 5. Do you see that?

A. Yeah.

Q. And in connection with that U5, the statements that are contained there where it says -- it would be page 122 at the bottom, where it says that he was discharged for violation of company policies, the reasons stated, are those reasons that are stated there accurate statements?

A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Where on 22 are you looking?

MR. KANE: 122 where it says "violation of



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

274

company policies".

CHAIRMAN: At the top, not the bottom.

BY MR. KANE:

Q. Right. Where it says "violation of company policy, representative lacks justification for charging the equity securities that exceeded the schedule.

Representative received written customer complaint and did not forward it."

In your view, are all those all accurate statements that were reported by Wells Fargo on Mr. Shaffer's U5?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And then I'm going to ask you another question and we're going to be done. In Mr. Shaffer's counterclaim, I won't ask the panel to go to it. It's in the counterclaim, he states here, Ms. Mary Mortensen, compliance manager who informed me of the termination actually stated that these infractions -- that these infractions would ordinarily not be grounds for termination.

Did you ever say that to Mr. --

A. I don't recall that. I do recall clearly that inclusive of all of the information provided is what brought us to the grounds. So if you don't mind me saying a little bit more, you know, as working in



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

compliance, and excuse me, but I almost feel like we're damned if we do and damned if we don't. So damned if we do is I'm here today. Damned if we don't is if we didn't terminate him and I had this e-mail that was memorialized and he continued.

Or if he came, you know, he did other things and it was brought to FINRA's attention, at that point, as a supervisory principal, that comes back on my head. And I'm responsible for it because I have this note that's memorialized that, oh, it's okay because Wells Fargo gouges your clients.

And so when you're making a determination for termination, you have to look at everything. And a big piece of that is -- you know, maybe I'm being a little selfish, but this is my career, too. This is something I take very seriously. And I'm not going to have something held out there in moratorium that later on has the ability to come back and ruin my career.

MR. KANE: I don't have any further questions at this time. It's about noon. We can take a lunch break.

CHAIRMAN: Right. We'll take a lunch break. Just a second. And afterwards, Mr. Shaffer, you will be able to ask Ms. Mortensen some questions. Do you have any other witnesses?



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

276

MR. KANE: No. I will be complete, other than my attorney fee affidavit. I think we can do that in closing arguments, would be what I think we could do.

CHAIRMAN: I suggest you present it during the time the evidence is in.

MR. KANE: Yes. I'm going to do that. As soon as Mr. Shaffer is done with Ms. Mortensen, I'll present it at that time.

CHAIRMAN: And then we'll probably close the hearing. And each of you is entitled, and, in fact, we would like each of you to make a closing argument to review the testimony and evidence as it has come in and argue from it and indicate also the amount of damages that you're seeking.

And I'm saying this to you as one who doesn't regularly do this sort of thing to give you some idea as to what's going to happen. And I think then we'll be able to complete today.

MR. KANE: Yes, I believe you're correct.

ARBITRATOR: I would like to ask one more question before she finishes. And that is: Had you had any previous problems of this type with him before?

WITNESS: No.

CHAIRMAN: What previous contacts had you had with Mr. Shaffer before either of these incidents



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

б

March 18, 2011

unraveled or occurred?

WITNESS: You know, there's a few things.

I mean, there's some things that I'm aware of. And if
you're trying to figure out why I was afraid or what
brought that, I don't know if that's what you're leading
into.

CHAIRMAN: No. I'm sort of asking your prior experience.

WITNESS: A lot of my prior contact was the trade review systems and stuff like that. And then there, you know, were -- I'd say that that was the biggest piece of it.

ARBITRATOR: But you had not had a trade review problem with Mr. Shaffer before this.

WITNESS: You know what, there's -- I can't specify -- there's always a trade with almost I would say every one of my financial advisers. I've had something come up where maybe I didn't have a switch letter and/or I wasn't comfortable with a trade or I felt that there was some sort of a product concentration or something that they need to be aware of. I'm in constant communication with my FAs. It's not like I never saw Mr. Shaffer, never spoke with him. Whenever there was something, I'm in constant communication with my financial advisers.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

278

MR. KANE: But nothing that stood out like what we had at the end.

CHAIRMAN: Would you say you had more or less contact with Mr. Shaffer than your other financial advisers?

WITNESS: Less. But I think that's indicative of the amount of trades he did. Where, the more trades that you review, the more opportunity that I'm going to be reviewing things that I'm going to have questions on.

If you don't do much trading, then that lessens the interaction I'm going to have with you because there's going to be less trades than I'm going to review.

CHAIRMAN: How long did you know

Mr. Shaffer?

WITNESS: Since his hire date.

ARBITRATOR: I have only one last question.

It's a follow-up to your comment that Mr. Shaffer was having a lot of problems with the bank.

WITNESS: Well, he was really, really angry and there was a lot of stuff that was going back and forth between his requests for medical disability.

At one point, I'm talking about my other partner, Cindy Mathes, he had threatened suicide with



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

her. I worked with a financial adviser who has threatened suicide and they followed through with what they said. And that's something you take seriously.

And so as a result of that, he was requested to do what we call a fitness of duty exam, where they -- we had reached out to him and he wanted him to contact our employee assistance group to say if there was anything any way that we would be able to help him.

We felt he needed to go through this fitness of duty to see if he was in a mental state to do his job. And he declined our offer for that fitness of duty. But it was that in culmination with other things. When I know someone has threatened suicide and we are pushing out a fitness of duty claim, since I've been with Wells Fargo, in my whole career, he's never done something like that. We kind of took all of those things.

I was afraid of him. It wasn't "I'm going to do something to you." It was more his state of mind. You hear about stuff every day.

ARBITRATOR: Sure. The other question I wonder about -- I'm sorry. I lost my train of thought -- would have had to do with the insurance, the fact that he had applied for disability. He felt he



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

280

needed time off and needed to -- Metropolitan had declined him the disability.

And there was also a piece which I can't recall exactly, but it had do with there was no psychiatric or a psychological issues that they felt the disability was warranted, the time off.

WITNESS: I did -- I wasn't aware that he had been denied. I know he told me, but I never saw the report from Met Life. None of that ever flows to my desk because he doesn't report to me.

ARBITRATOR: Would Jan Krug have been aware of that?

WITNESS: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN: I'm going to save some questions until after Mr. Shaffer. But just following up here, were you part of the decision to recommend a fitness for duty checkup?

WITNESS: No, I was not.

ARBITRATOR: I just have one question. Who

was?

WITNESS: Cindy Mathes and January Krug. I think I was out on vacation at that time and I came back and they were talking about it. We do a weekly admin meeting where the branch managers and sales managers talk once a week where we talk about issues, concerns



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

and things like that. And it was brought up in that meeting. And Cindy told me about the conversation that she had had and why they had requested the fitness for duty examination.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Off the record.

(Thereupon, a break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN: Back on the record Wednesday afternoon about 1:30.

The status now is for you, Mr. Shaffer, to cross-examine Ms. Mortensen. And since you don't do this every day, I'll just point out what you will be doing. You will ask her questions and for her to respond. This is not the time for you to give your opinions or your speeches.

You could say, for example, isn't it -- is it true or false that such and such is the policy at Wells Fargo, is the case. And let her give her response. It's not up to you at this point to argue with her.

In the closing statements, you can express your views based on the evidence, not based on your thoughts or thinking, but based on what somebody said or what some document showed.

MR. SHAFFER: Am I allowed to introduce evidence at this point that I think has bearing on the



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

whole matter?

CHAIRMAN: No. You've rested. Now, if you have something that is really important, we can waive that, because I don't want you to deny you your right to have a full hearing. What did you have in mind?

MR. SHAFFER: Remember yesterday, I had mentioned that I had an e-mail that I think served as an ideal character reference for Mary, who is a witness in this case against me. I was told I would need to save that until I was cross-examining Mary. Would I have a chance to do that?

CHAIRMAN: Has she seen the e-mail?

MR. SHAFFER: Yes, she has. Well, it was in my discovery packet.

CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. SHAFFER: And the person who wrote the e-mail is on my witness list.

MR. KANE: I saw what's in his packet.

It's not a to/from Ms. Mortensen. It relates to this third party that he had on his witness list. He wrote an e-mail to Mr. Shaffer.

And the objection was he had him on his list, he should have brought him in. I won't have a chance to cross-examine this person. It's not in any way impeachment to Ms. Mortensen. So I still object.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

283

CHAIRMAN: Right. And the issue in this case is not the character of Mary Mortensen.

MR. SHAFFER: Well, it has become an issue of my character.

CHAIRMAN: No, not really. It's what you did and didn't do and what they did and didn't do. So if that's what you have in mind as additional evidence, my inclination is not to allow it in, and pending the testimony that you obtained from Ms. Mortensen, whether it could be allowed in for impeachment purchases, and that's why I can't rule it out. But that's my inclination.

MR. SHAFFER: By the way, this is not hearsay or something that someone said to me. This is a direct quote from Mary Mortensen.

CHAIRMAN: Why don't you go ahead and ask your questions. At this point, I'm not going to allow that in because I don't see a basis for it.

MR. SHAFFER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: If one develops, I'll

reconsider.

MR. SHAFFER: I haven't been sworn in today and I'm not sure if Ms. Mortensen was sworn in.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, she has been. And when you were sworn in yesterday, it was ongoing.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

1	O	
4	О	4

MR. SHAFFER: I believe Ms. Mortensen has perjured herself a couple of times.

MR. KANE: I'm going to object. There's no call for something like that.

CHAIRMAN: That's exactly the sort of thing that you cannot do; namely make statements, active statements. You're to ask her questions.

MR. SHAFFER: Thank you.

EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. SHAFFER:

- Q. Mary, you mentioned that there is a process and some kind of a computer program that you deal with regularly call the broker audit or the Assenter blotter?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. How often do you check that information?
 - A. On a daily basis.
- Q. And how often do items come up on the broker audit or the Assenter blotter?
 - A. On a daily basis.

CHAIRMAN: Well, you said "or". That's compound. Is it the broker audit or the Assenter blotter that you're asking her about?

MR. SHAFFER: I don't understand the difference between the two. I thought they were kind of the same. Could you clear that up, Mary.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

Ζ	17	h	i	۲	r	а	+	i	on
_	7.	v	_	_	_	а	L	ᅩ	ULL

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

285

A. The broker audit is the trade blotter. The exception blotter is for any exceptions that are identified.

CHAIRMAN: Right. So I guess the question is how often do you look. And answer as to both of them.

WITNESS: Daily.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

- Q. And especially in respect to the exception blotter, those would be items of trade that needed your additional consideration or input?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. So those items come up daily. And how often are brokers fired when an item comes up on the exception audit for the first offense? I mean, when this exception audit or the broker audit comes up, are all the brokers on the broker audit fired for that day?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Well, what is the usual procedure then?
- A. Typically, it depends on what the issue is and the severity of the issue.
- Q. But is it the case that brokers sometimes would have several or even many items of this type and not be terminated?
 - A. Yes.



Toll Free: 888,486,4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

286

	Q.	What would make the difference between one
person	being	terminated on the first offense and one
person	being	able to have repetitive offenses?

MR. KANE: I'm going to object. She didn't testify to that. That's not her testimony. He's mischaracterizing it.

CHAIRMAN: She just testified that it's not unusual for brokers to have several places on an exception order.

MR. KANE: That she did say. The rest of it, she didn't say.

CHAIRMAN: He's asking if one appearance on the broker exception is justification for termination.

MR. KANE: Listen to the question.

ARBITRATOR: He asked the question well.

WITNESS: Can he repeat the question?

ARBITRATOR: Ask the question again.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

- Q. Were brokers that had trades turn up on the broker audit terminated on the first event?
 - A. No.
- Q. And what were the variables that resulted in a decision to terminate a broker or to let them have several of these events?
 - A. A violation of firm policy versus just a



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

287

review to determine whether or not I had pre-approved a trade, and I had the necessary documents received for switches, annuity trades or large trade approvals.

- Q. So let's say in a case where something came up in the broker audit that was considered a violation of company policy, was that financial adviser, financial consultant terminated immediately?
- A. I don't recall ever having an exception that showed a true violation of firm policy such as what had occurred.
- Q. Really? Okay. I'm surprised at that.

 Could you tell us, Jan Krug was the manager who terminated me and who I worked with for little more than a year. Can you tell us why Jan Krug is not with Wells Fargo anymore?

MR. KANE: Object.

CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear.

MR. SHAFFER: Why is Jan not with Wells

Fargo anymore?

CHAIRMAN: That's overruled -- I'm sorry --

sustained. That's not relevant.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

Q. Are you aware of any problems that brokers had with Jan's predecessor, Jon Scambray?

MR. KANE: Same objection. This case isn't



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

288

about --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN: Sustained.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

Q. If we could go back to the trades, which were reviewed in laborious detail this morning again after being brought up yesterday, I've been in the business 30 years, as you know. And I was a financial adviser, financial consultant at Wells Fargo.

And by looking at this information, I am truly unable to ascertain the actual correct amount of the commission charged in this case. If you could turn to the item of -- in Mr. Kane's exhibits, Item 10, and go to that 023 area where it's -- calculators on the top.

MR. KANE: She's there.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

- Q. And we talked about Mary's calculation of the correct commissions being a total of \$367. So there was an overcharge of \$637, according to Mary's notes on the bottom there. But not only does -- and Ms. McClaskey seemed to understand this, and I'm not understanding why in the darkened area at the top, it says "max commission \$460" for one thing. Could Mary explain that for us?
 - A. I couldn't before and I can't now.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

289

Q. So you did mention that. The other confusing thing is if you go back to Item Number 26, that it lists a maximum commission of \$690 on that particular trade. And if the commission down below in the nondarkened area is shown at \$197, there's one other item that shows that it's still a different amount. Here it is.

If we could flip to Item 20 under 10, ahead of that particular item, where it shows a 197, which are the numbers Mary used, here's another printout that shows that the compared value, which I assume is the appropriate commission, is \$368.

MR. KANE: She's already answered the question as to comparative value. I think it's asked and answered.

CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily by Mr. Shaffer.

Overruled. Go ahead.

WITNESS: The question again?

BY MR. SHAFFER:

- Q. How do we reconcile the compared value suggesting 368 was the correct amount for the trade, the other items that show 460 and even as low as 169. I just don't understand what the actual recommended commission was on this trade.
 - A. The recommended commission is what would be



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

290

identified on the commission calculator in the non-highlighted portion, which was the Wells Fargo commission schedule that had been provided to Thompson 1.

Q. Okay. So the correct amount of the commissions were the 197 amounts or the 368 amounts?

I'm confused even at this point, even with my experience in the business.

ARBITRATOR: That is what she's saying.

MR. SHAFFER: Well, I'd just like to point out that there's some discrepancy there about what the proper amount was.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

- Q. And, Mary, you had mentioned that you do not remember instances of brokers opting to increase the commission on a trade.
 - A. Not on an equity transaction, no.
 - Q. See, that's surprising because --

MR. KANE: I'm going to object to this characterization. She answered the question.

CHAIRMAN: You can't --

MR. SHAFFER: I've done it a lot of times myself. The broker is allowed to adjust the commission through the system. You don't have to override --

MR. KANE: I'd just like him to ask



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

	Arbitration March 18, 201
	293
1	questions. He's going to have the chance to do closing
2	arguments.
3	CHAIRMAN: I agree.
4	MR. SHAFFER: That's why I've asked the
5	question, because I've done it myself.
6	BY MR. SHAFFER:
7	Q. Okay. Mary, with regard to the T12
8	question, which with regard to the T12, did you not
9	say that this includes client names and account numbers?
10	A. I understand the commission runs include
11	the clients' accounts numbers and names.
12	Q. Right. But a T12 is not a commission run.
13	A. I wouldn't know the difference because I
14	don't pay attention to the production reports, again.
15	CHAIRMAN: So are you saying that the 12
16	does not include the names and addresses?
17	WITNESS: I will tell you my understanding
18	is anything off the commission run, we have names and
19	account numbers. I'm not familiar with the compensation
20	reports. That's what I know, is what I've seen.
21	CHAIRMAN: Does it have addresses and
22	Social Security Numbers?
23	WITNESS: No, it does not.
24	CHAIRMAN: Just name and account numbers.
25	WITNESS: Correct.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

292

DΥ	MR.	SHAFFER:
\mathbf{L}	1.11.	DITUIT I TIV.

Q. On the commission run, the T12, does it have anyone's name on that one?

MR. KANE: There's no document that says

T12.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHAFFER: It's referred to as T12,

which is a trailing 12.

CHAIRMAN: I think that's what

Ms. McClaskey has said.

MR. SHAFFER: I think Mary has had

involvement with T12s.

CHAIRMAN: What is your question?

BY MR. SHAFFER:

Q. My question was: Does it list client names and account numbers, and is that truly proprietary information? The answer is she doesn't know, I guess.

CHAIRMAN: I think that's her answer.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

Q. Okay. See, I'm having trouble with items I wanted to bring up as opposed to questions. Let me look through my notes one quick second.

Mary, in regard to Jan Krug's comment about drilling down on some clients, and you had mentioned that that refers to looking for opportunities to refer that client to what's called the private bank at Wells



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

Fargo; correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. Could you tell me what the minimum is for a client to participate in a private bank at Wells Fargo?
- A. To be in -- to work with a private banker, it's a million dollars relationship which includes deposits and loans. However, that doesn't mean that you can't still cross-reference other opportunities within that office, whether it's a wealth plan, some sort of estate plan, a private mortgage.

ARBITRATOR: Mary, for my own clarification, do you mean that if there is a client that does not have a million dollars in assets with the bank, that that client is still eligible to be referred to the private client area if -- if the broker can identify an issue that might be resolved for that client in the private banking area, even though she's not a member of the private banking group?

WITNESS: Yes.

ARBITRATOR: Thank you.

MR. SHAFFER: Okay. And I don't know, maybe you could advise me, should I even ask any questions about that final meeting when Mary was concerned that I may go postal. I don't think that it's really relevant in that that was after the time of my



Toll Free: 888,486,4044

	Arbitration March 18, 2011
	294
1	termination, for one thing.
2	CHAIRMAN: I thought are you talking
3	about a conference call?
4	MR. SHAFFER: No. The final meeting where
5	I returned the laptop and she came to tears and said she
6	was concerned about my going postal.
7	CHAIRMAN: Yes. Go ahead.
8	BY MR. SHAFFER:
9	Q. Mary, do you remember the gentleman that
10	accompanied you downstairs?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And I recall that you mentioned that first
13	we were to meet inside the office, and then I was
14	outside the office.
15	ARBITRATOR: Ask the question.
16	BY MR. SHAFFER:
17	Q. My question is: Who was with you to pick
18	up the laptop?
19	A. David Godding.
20	Q. And do you remember our conversation when I
21	returned the laptop?
22	A. No.
23	Q. Do you remember me stating in front of Dave
24	Godding, who is a current employee of Wells Fargo, I
25	believe, that as a response to you saying that I was



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

295

flipping out, I said, "Well, what about you calling the promissory note blood money" in front of Mr. Godding?

- A. I don't recall.
- Q. You don't recall that? It's certainly -- Mr. Godding is not on my witness list. But he can certainly verify that I made that statement.

CHAIRMAN: Go on, please.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

- Q. And then, Mary, in regard to other items that came up regarding my suggestion that I may kill myself, I was wondering where -- from where did you get that information? Why did you make that statement?
- A. It was discussed in a meeting with Cindy Mathes who apparently said that conversation took place with Ken Shaffer.
 - Q. What exactly did Ms. Mathes say?
- A. The -- it was in relation to the fitness of duty request, and that Ken had threatened suicide, that he might as well kill himself, quote, unquote.

ARBITRATOR: He said that to --

WITNESS: To Cindy Mathes.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

Q. Mary, do you think that that kind of information would be subject to a confidentiality requirement?



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

Arbitration March 18, 2011

296

MR. KANE: That's a legal conclusion, whether or not.

CHAIRMAN: She can answer as best she can whether it's a legal answer or not, whatever her understanding is.

A. I don't know.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Well, were you aware that Mr. Chung from Kane and Fischer contacted me several times to have me sign a release?

MR. KANE: I'm going to object to any conversations she had with an attorney in my office. That's attorney/client privilege.

CHAIRMAN: Attorney/client privilege covers communications. And I think the question asked whether she was aware that Mr. Chung had sought a release from Mr. Shaffer.

MR. KANE: Well, that assumes a fact not in evidence.

CHAIRMAN: And I don't know what that is all about, so I'm going to sustain the objection.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

Q. Okay. Mary, I was wondering if you were privy to the e-mail that is marked 000014 in my --

What tab, or what number?

MR. KANE:



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011 Arbitration 297 1 MR. SHAFFER: It's -- it doesn't really 2 have a number. It's in the very back, just probably 20 3 pages in from the back. 4 CHAIRMAN: Before or after the Met Life? MR. SHAFFER: It's before the Met Life, I 5 6 believe. 7 CHAIRMAN: And it's e-mails you're looking 8 for. 9 MR. SHAFFER: Yeah. It's an e-mail from --10 with Jan's name on it. It says "administrative leave option". 11 12 Α. I was not aware. BY MR. SHAFFER: 13 Okay. Because I wondered what Mark's 14 Ο. comment "I thought it was going to be suggested" --15 I'm going to object. She said 16 MR. KANE: 17 she's not aware of it. 18 CHAIRMAN: Is this the August 3rd? 19 MR. KANE: August 12th. It's got a W14 at 20 the bottom. 21 CHAIRMAN: Okay. And what is your 22 question? 23 BY MR. SHAFFER: 24 My question was if Mary was aware of this Q. 25 e-mail.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

298

CHAIRMAN: The one from you to Jan or the one from Jan to you?

MR. SHAFFER: No. This is from Mark Webster to Jan Krug, Christine Longley.

CHAIRMAN: Were you, Ms. Mortensen, aware of this e-mail prior to preparation for this trial?

WITNESS: No, I was not.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.

BY MR. SHAFFER:

- Q. Mary, you're familiar with the Wells Fargo compliance manual, I'm sure; right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Could you tell me if the compliance manual states that not submitting -- first of all, does a written complaint qualify as an e-mail complaint, as well?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And does the Wells Fargo compliance manual specify that a financial advisor, financial consultant would be terminated if they -- on the first event of not forwarding a client complaint.
 - A. No.
- Q. And, also, on the overcharging or what I refer to as a trade error of the Winneger account, does the Wells Fargo compliance manual specify that the



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

299

financial adviser will be terminated for the first instance of overcharging?

A. No.

MR. SHAFFER: Thank you. I rest my questions.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. I have a few questions, Ms. Mortensen. I'd ask you to look at Mr. Kane's Tab 8, in particular, the U5. Actually, I'm going to focus on the U5 and page 2 of the U5. And, specifically, the violation of the company policies, who prepared the U5 in this case?

WITNESS: The U5 is prepared by our licensing and registration department.

CHAIRMAN: Based on information they obtain from where?

WITNESS: Based on information obtained from the conference call that we had, and in correlation with our lawyers.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, Number 1, violation states "representative lacked justification for charging equity securities markup that exceeds the -- that exceeded the firm's full service equity schedule."

And as has been discussed here, if there was an equity schedule, why wouldn't that number that is the commission be automatically plugged into the trading



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

300

request? We've discussed here the number of the suggested amount and the number that Mr. Shaffer put in, and then there was a comparable number, and then there was a maximum number. Doesn't that appear to give some latitude to somebody to put in numbers between the max and the suggested number?

WITNESS: The only number that I've ever worked with is based off of the commission calculator. Or if you enter a trade and that commission populates, that number.

CHAIRMAN: Why wouldn't it always populate the suggested number?

WITNESS: If you override it, it won't populate it.

CHAIRMAN: And it's marked up. That is a violation, even though it's permissible by the system?

WITNESS: That's hard to answer.

CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

ARBITRATOR: What is the difficulty in answering that?

mark up something and are we following the prudent manual of do no harm to our clients.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then I believe it is in one of your tabs, I think it's 10, Mr. Kane, look at Tab



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

Arbitration March 18, 2011 301 10, and, particularly, Bates stamp 24. 1 That's a printed 2 Wells Fargo document, is it not? 3 WITNESS: The trade correction form, sir. 4 CHAIRMAN: Yes. The trade correction form? 5 WITNESS: Yes, it is. 6 CHAIRMAN: And the purpose of that it is to 7 correct trades? 8 WITNESS: Yes, it is. 9 CHAIRMAN: And if the broker corrected the commission which was pointed out to be too high, 10 wouldn't that correct the situation so there's no longer 11 12 a violation? 13 WITNESS: Yes. CHAIRMAN: And you have this form for that 14 15 very purpose, do you not? 16 WITNESS: Yes. But please keep in mind it 17 wasn't just that thing. It was everything combined that led to the decision. So it didn't -- just because we 18 corrected it, which we have an obligation to do for our 19 20 clients, but it is more about all -- everything combined when you look at the whole picture. 21 22 CHAIRMAN: Were there other instances where 2.3 you had to correct trades that Mr. Shaffer had placed?



WITNESS:

CHAIRMAN:

24

25

Toll Free: 888.486.4044

2700 Centennial Tower 101 Marietta Street Atlanta, GA 30303 www.esquiresolutions.com

In regards to marking up?

Equity trades.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

302

WITNESS: No.

CHAIRMAN: With regard to violation 2, it states that representative -- I'm back on the U5. Sorry.

MR. KANE: Tab 8.

CHAIRMAN: Violation 2 is, "The representative received a written customer complaint and did not forward to supervisor principal." But Mr. Shaffer has testified here, and I'll be interested if you know his testimony to be incorrect, that he returned the money and corrected that complaint straight away.

WITNESS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: So on both of these violations, they were corrected?

WITNESS: It was still a written complaint that wasn't forwarded to us, that had we not been aware of it, it could have escalated into a much different situation.

CHAIRMAN: Except that it was corrected?

WITNESS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: So it wasn't likely to escalate,

was it?

WITNESS: Because it was identified, no.

ARBITRATOR: My own recollection is that



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

303

the complaint came in on a Friday, and on Monday, it was corrected. When did you actually see the complaint so that you could have had any impact on its being corrected?

WITNESS: I was not -- we were not aware of until afterwards.

ARBITRATOR: So he corrected it himself?

WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And I think you said there was a gentleman in charge of combing e-mails to make sure that they got taken -- well, that they were, what, noted, I guess is what you were doing? And did that gentleman inquire into whether or not this complaint had been corrected and fixed so that the complaint was no longer in effect, so to speak?

WITNESS: Yes, he did.

CHAIRMAN: And so he was aware that Mr. Shaffer had returned the money which was apparently the subject of the complaint.

WITNESS: I can't answer that. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN: I can understand why you wouldn't know. And so is there any set policy -- strike that. I'm not going to ask that.

Okay. That's all I have. Thank you very much. If I have generated some questions that either



Toll Free: 888,486,4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

304

Mr. Kane or Mr. Shaffer has, and I mean questions, please go forward, and my colleagues as well.

MR. KANE: I don't have any additional questions. We can go to closing arguments whenever.

ARBITRATOR: I just want to reiterate what I think I heard and get a confirmation.

Several times it was asked if instances of two times having a deviation from the amount of the commission would have in and of itself constituted a reason for dismissal.

And, secondly, that one instance of a complaint, whether that in itself would have, or even in both instances, in the two instances that are listed here for termination explanation, whether they in and of themselves would have been a typical cause for dismissal.

WITNESS: I will say that we did terminate one other gentleman for failure to forward a written complaint.

ARBITRATOR: One time?

WITNESS: One time, yes.

ARBITRATOR: Of course, the circumstances may have been different in the sense that the complaint was not corrected within one business day as was in this case. So are they really comparable?



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

305

WITNESS: Yeah.

ARBITRATOR: But, typically, a complaint can come in from a client who, for his own reasons, may be very upset about something. He needed the money immediately and he wanted that money right now and he was being pressed by some outside event in his life, and so he took it out on the broker.

WITNESS: The issue I question is were proper disclosures made on that specific product and how that product worked.

ARBITRATOR: Do you recall any -- I don't recall any input in our hearings on that line at all.

Do you recall anything?

CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure what you're asking.

MR. KANE: I'm going to address it in my

closing argument.

CHAIRMAN: All right. Do you participate or, Ms. Mortensen, have you in the past participated in determining the wording that goes on a U5 termination explanation?

WITNESS: No.

CHAIRMAN: That's your representative

person that does that?

WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And as I understand it, this



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

language came out of or as a result of that conference call.

WITNESS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any -- okay.

MR. KANE: She's excused. She's not going to leave the room. Before we get to closing arguments, I did want to exhibit -- it's in the exhibit book, my fee affidavit, and kind of admit that. And we will be ready for closing arguments.

If the -- Exhibit 14, if you go to Claimant's Exhibit 14 -- and they tie together. 14, 15 and 16 go together. Basically, I prepared this affidavit before I came down previously to the hearing and I'll tell the panel: Previously, we had exchanged a fee affidavit of Mr. Chung and gave that to Mr. Shaffer. But we didn't complete it in discovery, in the prehearing exchange.

So he got a copy of not mine, but Mr. Chung's -- and because I was here at the hearing, we redid it for my affidavit. My affidavit really is quite clear. It sets forth the billing rate for me and the other attorneys, my rate at \$225 an hour.

It goes to the second page where it talks about the total paralegal and attorney's fees are, and that's \$29,814. And then it goes to the cost of the



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

307

hearing, of what Wells Fargo has expended. And of the \$8,862.06, \$1,700 is FINRA filing fees.

CHAIRMAN: Filing fees?

MR. KANE: Right. If you go to the next page, it kind of summarizes all of that. If you go to Tab 15, Tab 15 is the bill history that provides the detail, the backup for the \$29,814. If I go to the last page, you see there's that \$29,814, page 13, at the top on Tab 15.

ARBITRATOR: Okay.

MR. KANE: So that ties to my fee affidavit. Now, if you go to the first page, I want to make a statement here. And just so we're clear, since hope springs eternal, if you'll see on page 12 --

CHAIRMAN: Of?

MR. KANE: Of tab 15, I only have
January 4th, attend hearing eight hours. In order to
keep the record leave and not have to amend it, I'm
going to leave it this way. I'm not going to ask for
any more right now. I think it's cleaner and more
efficient to keep this affidavit the way it is.

But I want to orally advise the panel that it does not include January 5th. I don't want that to go against my client.

CHAIRMAN: We'll take judicial notice that



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

you're here today.

MR. KANE: And not to charge them as to what it relates to seek from Mr. Shaffer. More importantly, on the itemization of the cost, the \$8,862.06 that ties to the affidavit, that does not include my travel time here. That doesn't include hotel costs or airfare. None of that is included in this.

Wells Fargo for my travel costs or things of that nature. And then all of that ties into Tab 16, which we went through the summary of the unpaid principle of the \$74,617.76 accrued interest at the rate under the note. It's a mathematical calculation. And then the \$29,814, then the costs of eight \$8,862 for the total of \$116,661.02.

Just for the record, I would note that the \$29,000 is approximately 38 percent of what Wells Fargo is seeking, not that that necessarily is -- if you add the unpaid principle and the accrued interest, that figure comes to \$77,984.96. That's the \$74,000 and the \$3,000. So if I could move into evidence Exhibits 14, 15 and 16, that will be all of the evidence that we would intend to present.

CHAIRMAN: They will be admitted.

MR. SHAFFER: Excuse me. Am I allowed to



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

309

ask him questions about this?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, you can.

MR. SHAFFER: At this point?

CHAIRMAN: That would be appropriate yes.

They have not yet been admitted. Go ahead, Mr. Shaffer.

MR. SHAFFER: Now, I'm not totally familiar with the procedure here, as you're aware. It seems to me that I'm being billed for Wells Fargo's legal fees in defense of my counterclaim. And I wasn't -- I didn't know that that was the case or that I would be possibly responsible for legal fees in defense of my counterclaim. So could you just --

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kane, do you want to respond?

MR. KANE: Yes. And I intend to address that in my closing argument, if you'll just bear with me. I can do it now.

CHAIRMAN: I think his point is that his agreement was with regard to the promissory note and the fees and costs of that, but not necessarily the counterclaim.

MR. SHAFFER: Exactly.

MR. KANE: Bear with me. I have the --

CHAIRMAN: Agreement or alleged agreement.

MR. KANE: I'm doing that right now. Bear



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

with me. As the panel is aware, the promissory note specifically provides that he agreed to repay all of Wells Fargo's costs and is seeking to collect on the note.

The promissory note that has such a claim, Wells Fargo is entitled to its attorney's fees for defending against his counterclaim. And the case that I was -- I'm going to cite to the panel in my closing argument is Silego versus Castelluci, 21 California Commission App. 4th, 873 at 879 and 80. And it's 26 California Commission Reporter 2d, 439. It's a California Appellate Fourth District case in 1994.

The reason for that is that the courts have concluded when somebody brings their promissory note case and the other side challenges that with counterclaims that are so intertwined with the payment of the obligation on the promissory note, that those issues are so intertwined that you are entitled to get your attorney's fees for defending against the counterclaim because you're seeking to enforce your promissory note against all of these counterclaims to set off against the promissory note.

Because of that, that's the rationale that both the California courts and most courts have for allowing parties to have their attorney's fees, because



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

Arbitration March 18, 2011

311

it's essential to enforce this note that I had to defend against all these counterclaims. That's the case law in California that supports that rationale.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. SHAFFER: I have a question, if that's okay. I notice there are a number of your associates listed here besides Mr. Chung. And one during various amounts of time and various amounts of fees. I'm wondering, are all of these people authorized to be involved with the case in California?

MR. KANE: Each one filed the certificate.

Mr. Volts is no longer with my firm.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sohn?

MR. KANE: Yeah. He filed a certificate.

CHAIRMAN: Do you understand what he's

saying?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHAFFER: Yes. Because I received this

with Mr. Kane's involvement in this case and

Mr. Chung's. What about the others?

MR. KANE: We have them.

MR. SHAFFER: What about the others?

MR. KANE: There's one for Mr. Volts as

well.

MR. SHAFFER: That might be true. What

about the others?



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

CHAIRMAN: Some of these are paralegals.

MR. KANE: Some of these are paralegals where you don't need it. And I will tell you that I think the issue in California is if you're appearing at the hearing as well, and not necessarily working out of the Chicago office, but in any event, I can tell you the three principle attorneys working on this case were myself, Tom Volts and Mr. Chung, and all three of us filed our California certificates.

CHAIRMAN: Those are the only attorneys working on it?

MR. KANE: There may have been a Diane Fischer who was just a supervisor. But I don't think she --

ARBITRATOR: DCF?

MR. KANE: Yeah. She was a -- she didn't sign any. All she did was review pleadings and some of the work of the other attorneys. She didn't attend any pre-hearing conferences or anything related to this case. And she did not file a California certificate, nor was she required to.

CHAIRMAN: Not required because she did not appear here in California. And I believe Mr. Kane is correct. It's the appearance in California, it's not necessarily work that is done elsewhere. But you're



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

313

March 18, 2011

certainly entitled to ask questions about this last exhibit that he has introduced.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ SHAFFER: Those are all of my questions.

CHAIRMAN: All right. In that case, the exhibit will be admitted and we're marking it as, what, 14, 15, 16?

MR. KANE: I'm sorry, 14, 15 and 16. I apologize.

(Claimant's Exhibits 14, 15 and 16 were admitted into evidence.)

ARBITRATOR: Yeah. That's what I have.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we will be entitled to hear your closing argument, and we're asking you to limit your comments to summation of what you believe has been proven. It should include a summary of your final request for damages. We can do it as a range as opposed to a specific monetary amount. It's up to you.

And you may include a description of each theory of the damages, why you think they are appropriately or should be ordered.

The parties may begin their closing arguments. And the way we go is that the claimant typically will make first presentation and then the respondent makes their response or their closing



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

argument. And the claimant can rebut the closing argument of the respondent.

And it's also possible that the claimant not make an opening statement, but include in the rebuttal all of their remarks. And Mr. Kane will advise us what he wants to do in that respect. And let me just read further in the script to see if it's relevant. Hold on just a second. This statement is to be read.

We realize that at the time the claim was initiated, the parties may not have had all the information needed to accurately or completely calculated claims for parties requesting damages.

Please provide us with a summary of your final request for damages. You may present your final damage request as a range as opposed to a specific amount.

In other words, what you say to us now may be different than what was originally put down in your claim or counterclaim. Okay.

The final question that it is suggested I ask, do the parties have any other issues or objections that you would like to raise that you have not previously raised? And that's objections or issues.

MR. KANE: On behalf of Wells Fargo, we've raised everything.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

315

MR. SHAFFER: I have a question as to could I introduce information that -- a part of my exhibits that I forgot to introduce before that I think may have bearing on the situation, or are we past that phase?

CHAIRMAN: What are you talking about?

Because we're going to take this up as kind of a special request.

MR. SHAFFER: Please. Ms. Mortensen commented that the --

CHAIRMAN: What exhibit are you looking at?

MR. SHAFFER: I'm looking at an e-mail
that's part of my package.

CHAIRMAN: And is this the e-mail we talked about before several times.

MR. SHAFFER: No. This is just one I forgot to bring up. But I just think it might be pertinent in that Ms. Mortensen commented that --

CHAIRMAN: Let's find the e-mail first.

You find it, and then --

MR. SHAFFER: It's Number 4 under my exhibits.

CHAIRMAN: And you might give us a general description of what it is and why you think it's appropriate.

MR. SHAFFER: It's an e-mail that I had



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

sent to Mark Webster regarding concerns that I had had concerning sales practices at Wells Fargo Investments. The reason that I think it is pertinent is that Ms. Mortensen commented that the policy infractions that I committed were not ordinarily reason for termination, but it was the total package of our relationship. And I think that our relationship may have been affected by this particular e-mail.

MR. KANE: If that's the reason he wants to admit it, I'm going to object to it. He hasn't raised any of that in any of his counterclaims here. He's got issues here about reverse convertibles, the unexplained disappearance of a convert. None of that relates to the issues here.

CHAIRMAN: Except that Ms. Mortensen did testify that it wasn't these two specific violations in and of themselves, it was the whole bunch of things.

And one of the things that she talked about was e-mails that are in the record somewhere. That can come back to bite you. This one I hear Mr. Shaffer saying may be one of those e-mails.

MR. KANE: She's not listed on here as having seen it. If he wants to introduce it, somehow she was tainted by what she saw her, unless she saw it.

ARBITRATOR: I have a question. The e-mail



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

317

is addressed to Mark Webster. Was Mark Webster one of the participants in that phone conversation.

MS. MORTENSEN: I believe so.

MR. KANE: Then to save time, I'm going to withdraw my objection.

CHAIRMAN: Okav.

MR. KANE: He can refer to it in his closing argument rather than testify to it now, if that's acceptable to the panel.

CHAIRMAN: Of course. It then will be introduced. We are not I think -- I want to make clear, taking into evidence this whole book, what we have taken in are your remarks that you made, some of which were read from pages here, which is fine. And we also have taken in those documents which you have referred to. Just like we have taken into evidence all of the tabs that Mr. Kane provided, including these last four.

I'm not sure how we can identify those documents that are in your booklet which we have talked about and about which there's been no objection as opposed to the many other documents in here which we have not talked about, other than to state that that which has been referred to and has not been objected to shall be considered in evidence. So I'll let my colleague figure out how to write that one up. But I



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

318

think we all understand.

MR. KANE: Yes. I have no problem, no objection.

CHAIRMAN: I think it's the fairest way to handle this. Okay. Any other issues or objections or comments?

MR. SHAFFER: I have one other question.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. SHAFFER: It was brought up by
Ms. Mortensen that I was in some type of agitated mental
state and that I had threatened taking my own life. And
I have information that's in this original presentation
book regarding that situation. And I was wondering if I
could bring that.

CHAIRMAN: The one thing that I did see was that fitness duty recommendation or memo.

MR. SHAFFER: Ms. Mortensen brought up -- I have in this information that's already been provided a note about that fitness for duty memo, which I would like to present.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that would be fair to bring in since the fitness memo was discussed.

MR. KANE: I just want to make sure I know which one he's referring to.

CHAIRMAN: Which one are you looking at?



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

Arbitration March 18, 2011 319 1 MR. SHAFFER: This memo or my comments 2 regarding that. 3 CHAIRMAN: What do you want to reduce or add? 4 5 MR. SHAFFER: This is easy. There's notes on discovery materials, a cover page, and it's the one 6 7 right after that. 8 CHAIRMAN: You may think it's easy. 9 MR. KANE: The one after that is not the 10 document. And --MR. SHAFFER: Not the e-mail. 11 12 MR. KANE: So I object to that if --MR. SHAFFER: But the e-mail document was 13 introduced and I'd like to respond to that. 14 15 MR. KANE: If he wants to introduce it, Mr. Chairman --16 17 CHAIRMAN: Tell me about -- this testimony 18 page: 19 MR. KANE: Yeah. That I object to. 20 CHAIRMAN: This amounts to your testimony. 21 This is not a document. MR. SHAFFER: No. 22 The document was introduced by Ms. Mortensen. 23 24 MR. KANE: No, she didn't introduce any 25 documents regarding that.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

320

CHAIRMAN: We have referred to the fitness, and that will be included because it was referenced by Ms. Mortensen. I'm talking about the memo or the letter suggesting a fitness --

MR. SHAFFER: The whole fitness for duty, I'd like to comment on that.

CHAIRMAN: You can comment in the closing statement because the subject has been introduced.

MR. SHAFFER: But I never had a chance to make any statement regarding that.

ARBITRATOR: You can do that.

CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. SHAFFER: Right now?

CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. SHAFFER: You see, I wondered if this would come up. Again, I had received several e-mails and phone calls from Mr. Chung.

MR. KANE: I'm going to object to e-mails. That was in discovery. That has nothing to do with this. I guess what I need to do is we might as well --rather than having him testify to other documents, he doesn't have it in his packet. I'll pass it out to the panel because it's exactly what we're talking about here.

CHAIRMAN: Are you familiar with what he



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

321

has here?

MR. SHAFFER: No, I'm not. I think it's the document Mr. Chung wanted me to release.

ARBITRATOR: Take a look and see if you -MR. KANE: These are documents that we
produced in discovery to Mr. Shaffer that relate to the
fitness for duty issues and his responses to it. It's
the actual documents as opposed to his narrative.

CHAIRMAN: We don't know what his response was, do we?

MR. KANE: I have it here.

CHAIRMAN: Do you want to know what your

response was?

MR. SHAFFER: I have a written response here and I never returned the form that Mr. Chung wanted me to return to release this information. But this has been already introduced. There's nothing new here.

MR. KANE: None of these documents have been introduced.

CHAIRMAN: I don't think we've seen this.

MR. KANE: Let me be clear about what he's referring to about Mr. Chung. Mr. Chung asked him to sign an agreed protective order that the documents that we marked confidential would be treated as confidential.

I have the proposed protective order. Mr. Shaffer



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

322

refused to sign it.

In my closing argument, I'm going to ask the panel to sign it and return any confidential material.

CHAIRMAN: What confidential material are you concerned about?

MR. KANE: In discovery, we provided him all of the compensation plans of Wells Fargo. All of that is confidential and proprietary material. We only mark confidential things that were confidential and proprietary. Things such as his own records, we didn't mark these confidential.

I'm going to ask -- at the conclusion of my closing statement, I'm going to ask the panel as part of their award to so instruct him. That is the release he's referring to. I really resent the way he tries to categorize things.

CHAIRMAN: So this was a protective order to keep confidential proprietary information of Wells Fargo.

MR. KANE: Yes. And what I'm going to

do --

CHAIRMAN: Anything else?

MR. KANE: The order is a little more

extensive than what I've just said. But what I'm going



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

323

to do in my closing argument, rather than have this order entered, I'm going to ask that the panel have him return any documents to Wells Fargo any documents that were marked confidential.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shaffer, do you have any comments on this?

MR. SHAFFER: I have comments on the whole fitness for duty thing, and the reason.

CHAIRMAN: Comments on what?

MR. SHAFFER: The reason I didn't sign that document is that I figure, you know, if -- what the enemy -- if your friend is your enemy or however that goes, why should I provide that information if they're asking me for it?

I also think that is trying to get me to surrender my rights you know the Americans with Disabilities Act.

CHAIRMAN: Whether you sign it or not, I guess we don't care. But Mr. Kane is asking us to order you to return any proprietary information or proprietary documents that are proprietary to Wells Fargo. That's what he's asking.

ARBITRATOR: That they sent to you during the exchange of documents.

MR. SHAFFER: I don't have a problem with



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

324

that. I don't have any use for them. I'm not sure I have them all.

CHAIRMAN: That's the order that we anticipate him to make.

MR. SHAFFER: So the documents they already sent me in the discovery?

ARBITRATOR: That are marked confidential, he wants those back.

CHAIRMAN: So that apparently will be ordered. Do you have any anything else to say on --

MR. SHAFFER: I'd still like to make my comments on the fitness for duty thing. Here's what I have. It's in my book. I truly did not notice the letter -- there's a letter inviting me to take an administrative leave. That's been introduced; right?

MR. KANE: No, the letter has not been introduced. What I'd like to do to make sure the record is complete is have the panel accept this.

CHAIRMAN: Accept what? What is this?

MR. KANE: When he finishes, he's talking about administrative fitness for duty. He's not using any documents. He's only using what he wrote after the fact. I could cross-examination him because we didn't offer this before, is this the letter you received? Is this the response you made? That's all I would do



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

Arbitration March 18, 2011 325 1 because he's bringing it up. 2 MR. SHAFFER: I'm happy to share those 3 documents with the panel. 4 CHAIRMAN: What is that? 5 MR. SHAFFER: Do you want to see them? 6 CHAIRMAN: What are you holding in your 7 hand? 8 MR. SHAFFER: It is a letter from Jan Kruq. 9 It's also copied in my packet. And it says this letter 10 is --11 CHAIRMAN: Right. MR. SHAFFER: -- regarding our concerns 12 about your behavior in the following areas. One thing 13 I'd like to point out, and I have my wife's signature on 14 15 this, I do not have any recollection of ever receiving a letter. I received e-mails from Jan Krug, I never 16 17 received a letter in the mail. This letter is to 18 confirm the conversation. 19 Part of my exhibits is my wife also signed 20 that that she does not have any recollection of ever 21 receiving this. 22 CHAIRMAN: Right. So I noted on that 23 letter that you stated that. 24 MR. SHAFFER: Yes. It goes on in bold 25 print, "We have reason to believe that you are not able



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

to work because of a possible medical problem. You are constantly negative in your attitude and express thoughts of killing yourself." And, again, that's what prompted the fitness for duty item that Mary brought up earlier, which I would like to respond to. Because it's --

CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. SHAFFER: I truly do not have any recollection of receiving this letter. Please see second paragraph. "We have to reason to believe that you are not able to work because of a possible medical problem." Is this the reason that I was terminated? I think the ADA has wording to protect wrongful termination based on health problems.

I do not understand the reference to thoughts of killing myself. It is possible that I said the episodes of sleep apnea and the inability to catch my breath made me fearful of death or made an offhand remark to being better off dead. But I don't think I've he ever heard of anyone dying from sleep apnea, and I did not harbor suicidal thoughts. If I said something in that regard, it must have been offhand and cynically humorous.

I do not remember that in reference to one short notice mandatory call event, I informed Ms. Krug



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

327

that I had a conflicting doctor appointment. She sent me back an e-mail that said just "Really?" Suggesting she thought that I was not telling the truth. And in what I thought was a humorous reply, I said, "No, really. This appointment has been scheduled for some time. Really, I think I will have to sell my house. Really, I wish I were dead."

If anyone had bothered to ask me, I could have told them that I had no suicidal thoughts. As far as Ms. Krug's concern for my health, she never seemed to be the least bit interested, nor was Ms. Brandell. Her comment on my return from two months leave was, "Well, you look better."

More telling is that another financial advisor Ron Uren needed hip surgery --

MR. KANE: I'm going to object to that.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ SHAFFER: I thought that part might not be -- so I'll stop there.

MR. KANE: Can you mark that 18 that I've handed to you? It's W12 through 14. I'll hand it to the panel. Claimant's Exhibit 18. It will be at the back, the white notebook.

CHAIRMAN: And it is --

MR. KANE: I have them identified.

CHAIRMAN: Oh, this is the letter.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

MR. KANE: Well, there's more to it. So as it relates to the first page of Exhibit 18, this is the letter -- I don't know if it's a letter or e-mail. You say you don't recall receiving it; is that correct?

MR. SHAFFER: I never got a letter in the mail. I've never seen this letter before. I've never seen an e-mail with this information on it.

MR. KANE: Go to the next page. Did you receive this e-mail from Cindy Mathes to you dated August 10th of 2009?

MR. SHAFFER: I believe so. It's addressed to me. I must have got it.

MR. KANE: "Per our conversation and as previously communicated, you would be paid for your salary for the administrative leave. There is no negotiation on the base pay for administrative leave. If a doctor recommends medical leave, you would be eligible for short-term disability. And I've copied below how the benefits base is calculated."

And you received that from her; correct?

MR. SHAFFER: Correct.

MR. KANE: If you go to the third page at the bottom, you sent an e-mail after that on August 12th to Jan Krug; correct?

MR. SHAFFER: Correct.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

329

MR. KANE: And you said, "I cannot afford to take you up on the administrative leave offer. The income that I would receive from the recoverable draw, which you erroneously refer to as salary, would result in financial hardship if I was to be judged unsuitable for duty."

In other words, you declined the offer that was made to you by Wells Fargo; right?

MR. SHAFFER: Right. And I can explain why.

MR. KANE: I'd just like to move that into evidence so that the record is complete.

CHAIRMAN: Is that all right?

MR. SHAFFER: Sure.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are we about ready to go into closing arguments?

MR. KANE: And as you had indicated, I will reserve my entire closing for rebuttal.

CHAIRMAN: Which is another way of saying, Mr. Shaffer, that you go first.

MR. SHAFFER: Okay. Well, and please guide me on this, because I realize that -- you know, I understand what you've told me about the format, and I'm trying to stick with that. But obviously there's some flexibility there.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

Okay. Regarding the promissory note, the -- remember page 2 of the promissory note agreement states that this promissory note will be enforced, interpreted and some other term based on the -- laws of the State of California.

And the thing is that the promissory note is unenforceable based on the laws of the State of California. And, please, if I could ask anything, please review my excerpts from the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement Policies and Interpretation Manual or go to the website, because you will find that the points I've made, which I don't need to review again unless you'd like me to, basically make the promissory note unenforceable.

And there is also contract law involved here. And the promissory note is also unenforceable under a number of aspects of contract law that I have quoted. Those are my scratchy notes. Excuse me.

The promissory note agreement states the note shall be interpreted, enforced and governed under the laws of the State of California. Please review the California Division of Labor Standards enforcement policies and interpretation model.

A promissory note demand is clearly not allowed under California labor law. And in fact, it



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

creates a type of employment contract for the period of the loan forgiveness.

My next point, wrongful termination, nowhere in any Wells Fargo policy or compliance manual is it stated that the types of infarctions that I committed are grounds for termination.

And Ms. Mortensen has also replied verbally that they would not ordinarily be causes for termination. In fact, the manual allows three client complaints per year, according to the actual manual, which is one of my exhibits, and does not specify actions for not forwarding a complaint. Moreover, even an at-will employee has the right of justified termination.

As far as withholding disability benefits, my disability benefits were provided by Wells Fargo, I thought, declined by Met Life while two physicians had recommended that I needed to take time off for this medical condition. Those exhibits are in my booklet. I contacted Wells Fargo Employee Benefits regarding this denial and received no response.

As far as withholding commissions is involved, the situation is clearly addressed under the California employment law defining commissions and whether commissions can be withheld based on the



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

employer's cost of doing business. And that's another point that I have already addressed.

But as far as libel or slander on Form U5 and infractions that are not listed for reasons of termination are ambiguously disclosed resulting in my not being able to procure employment during a period that could have been the most productive of my career.

And in regard to damages, my actual damages are well over one million. Many of these infractions suggest treble damages. My treatment was a malicious response to my concern, Well's lack of fiduciary responsibility, my health issues and disability.

I'm sure an attorney representing me would suggest the damages be much higher to include emotional damages as well, and that a message needs to be sent to Wells Fargo regarding employee rights and their violation of California's public policy doctrine.

Damages and sanctions should also be assessed against Kane and Fischer because they obviously are aware of California employment law and labor contract law, or they should be. So either they are not even aware of California -- these provisions that I pointed out, or they're aware of them and they're just trying -- they're taking advantage of the arbitration process, the panel and myself.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

Would this be the time when I can bring up the e-mail that we discussed? During my closing arguments, right, which I think may have colored my -- no, the e-mail.

CHAIRMAN: No, we're talking about Mary Mortensen. Which one are you talking about?

MR. SHAFFER: Remember the e-mail that we discussed that was to Mark Webster that I thought might have affected the firm's feeling about my continued employment?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. SHAFFER: This will be the time I introduce this. On March 9th of 2009, I wrote Mark Webster an e-mail which is Exhibit 4 in my package. It says, "Hi, Mark. I've been issued a formal written warning for unsatisfactory production from Barbara. My monthly goal is \$20,666, which is 80 percent of my actual goal", but that was the rule for 2009 after the markets collapsed in 2008. Everyone was expected to generate 80 percent or more of their goal.

"I had total production of \$20,100, missing the mark by 500. My year-to-date is \$41,439, an average of \$20,719.50 per month, and higher than the original requirement. And I am now threatened with termination in a time when prior to this meeting I felt like I was



Toll Free: 888,486,4044

March 18, 2011

gaining momentum.

For March I booked my first TransAmerican
Heritage Builders sale, received my first in force
policy review and built business in fixed annuities. I
feel my branch relations are excellent. I have no
customer complaints. I was 14 out of 29 reps for the
month of the February and 8th percentage to goal. This
is shortly after I received the threat for termination.

Complicating the situation is the fact that I have an outstanding promissory note. Barbara has informed me that the unamortized amount would be due back to Wells, a financially disastrous situation. I cannot believe that Ms. Brandell is subjecting not only myself but other FCs to this type of mental duress in a time of crisis. Do you think this is fair and reasonable?"

And then this is where I said that "This is one of the discriminatory sorts of behaviors, that I took eight weeks off last year, October, November for a health problem that I'm still being treated for. I currently take eight pills a day.

I was denied short-term disability from

Metropolitan Insurance with the explanation that my

medical records do not support disability payments, even

though I would assume that the recommendation to take



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

time off was part of my records. They effectively overruled my doctor. Amazing.

This situation affected my productivity before I left and I had two months of zero production. Barbara states that the condition of written warning is based on last year's production as well. I was on track to achieve my annual sales goal last year until July 1st. I believe my treatment is partly based on verifiable illness."

And then I get into a couple points that I think Mr. Kane objected to, which is pointing out that there's misrepresentation of a product. Which on the next page, also labeled 4, misrepresentation of material facts is in the general code of conduct prohibited business practices.

And do you think that with these -- this problem I'm having with Ms. Krug and Brandell, do you think that Mark Webster would have called or e-mailed or taken any action to communicate with me, especially when I pointed out that there was misrepresentation going on? Well, he did not. I have never had a personal conversation with Mark Webster, never; not an e-mail conversation to me, not a personal phone conversation. I had never been invited to his office.

This, again, is after complaining of a



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

misrepresentation going on in the branch. I can talk more about that, but I believe Mr. Kane would like to object to that.

"So in closing, I am hoping that I can be on a more than month-to-month plan which is only reasonable since it could compromise my ability to suggest the best course of action to my clients. And I'm available to verify, discuss any of these items at your request and will continue to provide support for clients."

Again, I think that that e-mail has been mentioned to me as something that never should have been written and that I was, you know, tying my own noose for having said it. And I think it could have affected my termination.

So in closing, we had Ms. Mortensen state that the infraction that I was guilty of would not be reason for termination, and that I think there's other issues going on here.

I would like to briefly address her statement that I scared her, and actually remember Ms. Mortensen was driven to tears when describing the situation of me returning the laptop. And she mentioned a couple times that I was slouched down in my car.

This is just a little humorous sideline.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

My car is a Mazda RX8, a sports car. If it were sitting here, the roof of the car is right here. I'm 6-foot-2. I have to be slouched down to enter the vehicle.

I was never -- never, never did I in any way threaten Ms. Mortensen or anyone else. You can see by my e-mails, I never threatened any kind of violence. I'm a nonviolent type of guy. Right now I'm outraged. I'm being held up here, I'm in a \$100 a night motel across the street. I'm being hit with legal fees for things that I don't understand. I'm as outraged as I've ever been. I think you can see I'm not a violent person. I don't have it in me. I never threatened anyone.

For Mary to say she was afraid I was going to go postal and I was slouched down in my car is just ridiculous. And Mary, congratulations on the crying thing. You never cried at the point of our meeting. But I think that was a great little bit of acting.

And I never threatened anyone. I returned the laptop at that time. And, again, a gentleman by the name of Dave Godding was with Mary there and would know that I handed her the laptop and we said goodbye and that was it. And then I had to get back down in my car and slouch back down to my car. I just wanted to say something about that.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

ARBITRATOR: I have a question. Are you saying that the laptop you gave was the correct laptop, it was not your personal laptop?

MR. SHAFFER: Not initially. The Wells Fargo computer was a Compaq laptop computer and I happen to have a personal Compaq laptop computer.

When I was called on an afternoon at the branch and I was told by Ms. Krug to -- first we discussed the e-mail and then she told me -- it was approximately 1:15 at that time. And she said, "Be at the Roseville office at 2:00. Bring your laptop and your keys."

And that is from the -- you know, the communication within Wells Fargo, everyone knows, all the financial advisors know when the word is bring your laptop and your keys, you're terminated. I've even heard that explained before. So I knew that I was going to be terminated.

And what I did was put the laptop in the trunk and I had hoped to find someplace that could remove the information regarding my clients that I brought to Wells Fargo, which, again, was the most substantial part of my client base that were not covered by a noncompete agreement, and hopefully pull off a T12. And I found that there was nothing that could be done.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

The computer was locked up.

So I returned it to Mary the next morning. I had both computers in the trunk of my car and I had given her the incorrect computer. That's the end of that.

CHAIRMAN: Anything more, Mr. Shaffer?

MR. SHAFFER: Do I need to review those

items? I don't think I need to review the items again

in regard to the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement

Policies.

CHAIRMAN: No. You have provided them and they are available to us is.

MR. SHAFFER: I would appreciate you considering those and reading those over at your leisure as a part of this decision. Because, again, I don't understand how the promissory note could possibly be enforced given the provision or how Mr. Kane could enforce this action upon all of us.

CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Kane is not a party to this matter.

MR. SHAFFER: And that's the whole story. Again, the other part of my exhibits is records of my attempts at my employment. Mr. Chung had subpoenaed records of employment listed that I had worked for without any kind of cooperation with me.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

And the two that he brought back that said they had no record of me applying for, one of which was one of the most embarrassing situations of my professional career, and the situation with E-Trade where I was told -- and I refer to that in my documents as well.

But I was told that I was the one that they wanted there in the office and they could -- I was told specifically they could benefit from my experience.

So on the appointment there, having gone to see the branch manager, that coming back is one of the qualifiers to interview with the other brokers in the office. The third time I was to meet with the branch manager to formalize my agreement. The branch manager had already told me I was the candidate they wanted to hire.

When I arrived at that appointment, the branch manager, Lou Hudson, who won't return my call or give me any information, came out and said, "We're not going to be able to meet today." Wow, just like that, we're not going to meet. I said, "Oh, okay. Well, you'll call me?" He said, "Yeah. Well, someone will call you."

So I returned home and I called my contact at E-Trade who had sent application documents to me. I



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1.5

March 18, 2011

said, "What is going on with Lou Hudson?" She explained to me -- it is in here and documented, she explained to me that because of the entries on my U5 and because of E-Trade's requirement that what they call investment consultants be registered in all states so you could take a call that came in from anywhere and help these people, they said that the entries on my U5 would require them to write a explanation in some states when I was being registered in those states; that the state regulatory agency would question the U5 entries. And for that reason, I was no longer considered a candidate.

And, again, I have a letter here signed by my wife, if you'd like an independent opinion of how this whole situation has affected me. But, I mean, can you imagine the dismay when you think you have a job lined up and these U5 entries foiled it for you?

And that's why there were instances where Mr. Chung had forwarded to me an e-mail of E-Trade saying we don't have a record of this man applying. I tried to get some verification of that. I am truly black-listed from E-Trade.

And I have a list of other employers that I have interviewed with as well as my rejects, my e-mail rejects from Monster.com.

So as far as damages are concerned, the



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

. 14

March 18, 2011

problem is, you know, if I could find -- as you know, I was unhappy at Wells Fargo. I was particularly unhappy with their constant concentration and concern with revenue amounts irrespective of the client base or what might be best for the clients. So I might be happy to leave if I could get a job making say \$100,000 doing anything else. But, again, I'm not able to get a face-to-face interview doing anything other than brokerage. I think that affects my damages.

Obviously, I'd love to get another job and go to work again. I haven't worked in over a year now. What I've done is eroded my savings down to practically nothing. The next alternative is to withdraw money from an IRA, which is a total of \$100,000. After that, I'll be out of money.

You see these guys out here on the corner with last week's clothes on. I can understand their plight much better now. It's not too far from realizing that if I can't find a job, I could be homeless at some point.

The other thing I'd like to mention is Mr. Reece was nice enough on an earlier conference call to suggest that I write a letter to Wells Fargo and ask that they might adjust the items on my U5. And I just wanted to mention that one of my exhibits is that I did



Toll Free: 888,486,4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

343

write that letter and I never got any kind of response.

That, I'm sure everyone will be happy to know, is all.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Shaffer. Do you want to take a short break?

ARBITRATOR: 5, 10 minutes.

(Thereupon, a break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Kane, your closing comments?

MR. KANE: Thank you. At the outset, let me take this opportunity on behalf of myself and Wells Fargo to thank the panel. The panel has showed obvious attention and patience during this hearing.

I know Mr. Shaffer appreciates it, and it's probably one of the only things that Mr. Shaffer and I are going to agree on in my closing remarks.

Really, I ask the panel now what I asked at the beginning of the hearing, and that is that you require Mr. Shaffer to do nothing more than honor the written contractual agreement that he signed when he accepted the loan from Wells Fargo for \$111,347. And in this regard, the evidence is really not in dispute.

And I think the evidence has clearly established that prior to Mr. Shaffer joining Wells Fargo, he was aware that he would be eligible to receive



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

a loan from Wells Fargo at the end of his 18th month of employment if he met that production requirement of \$217,500 in his best 12 months, that he'd be eligible to receive a loan.

And this is clearly set forth in the documents. The two offer memos that he signed, he signed one on June 6th and one on June 9th. They're in Exhibits 2 and 3. Those offer letters clearly state that any such payment would be pursuant to a five-year loan.

It clearly states -- and this is all before he ever joins the firm. It clearly states that it would be forgiven over the five-year period each month. It clearly states that if he left the firm for any reason after he accepted this loan, whether voluntary or involuntary, he would have to repay the balance.

So this was spelled out to him long before he joined the firm when he signed those two offer letters. The evidence is established, 18 months after he joined Wells Fargo, Wells Fargo did exactly what it promised to do.

Even before that, there's no dispute.

Wells Fargo paid him that nonrecoverable draw for the four months, the \$48,000. He doesn't dispute that.

They gave him the 40 percent payout from June 15th of



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

'06 to December 31st of '07. He doesn't take issue with that.

And at the end of -- in January of 2008, at the end of those 18 months, Wells Fargo again did what it said it would do under that offer letter. And that is it lent him the \$111,347 for which there's no dispute. Mr. Shaffer signed a promissory note and that's Exhibit 5.

And all you have to do is look at Claimant's Exhibit 5 and you can see from the language that Exhibit 5 is clear and unambiguous. It states it's a loan. It states it's payable over five years. It states it's going to accrue interest. It states that he is going to have to repay it if he leaves Wells Fargo for any reason, whether voluntary or involuntary.

In this regard, I think it's significant that Mr. Shaffer doesn't deny that he signed the promissory note. He doesn't deny that he received the \$111,347. I went through the terms of the promissory note, each of them. He admits that he understood the terms of the promissory note, including the fact that he would have to repay the loan if he left, whether involuntarily or voluntarily.

The evidence has established that he was discharged from the firm on October 1st of 2009 and he



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

has not paid the unpaid balance or the accrued interest on that loan. And both factually and legally -- and as arbitrators, you do have to follow the law.

Factually and legally, under the term of the written contract that he signed, he has to repay that money to Wells Fargo. But rather than acknowledge what is his clear contractual obligation, Mr. Shaffer has come up with a myriad of theories to avoid honoring his obligation.

And I understand he's not a lawyer. But he has taken things out of context and has stated the law to the extent it's very difficult for me even to start to address, but I need to do that. So the first issue he has is -- I'm using his issues, that I can address each one of his issues.

It's in his issues, promissory note, originally described as a bonus, never explained. I never understood the terms. Well, it's clear from the offer memo that it was explained to him that this was a promissory note, a loan and not a bonus. Nowhere in either of those offer letters that he signed does it ever refer to this as a bonus. And it's not until even 18 months later after he's joined the film that he receives the loan.

And it's clear under the promissory note



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

that that's exactly how it's described, as a loan.

There's no reference in the promissory note that this is a bonus. It never happened. It was never described as a bonus and the documents confirm that.

Well, when he didn't like the fact that the offer memo calls it a loan and the promissory note calls it a loan, he said, well, look here, on the payroll it says net pay; so therefore, it's not a loan because on that payroll statement it's net pay.

Well, you know, that's simply frivolous. What that was was an automatic deposit into his bank account where they used the payroll system to make an automatic deposit of \$111,347 into his bank account. And the documents --

MR. SHAFFER: Objection.

CHAIRMAN: The only objection that would be heard here is if Mr. Kane is referring to something that has not been put in evidence. That's the only basis for an objection to closing arguments. Go ahead. In other words, introducing something new.

MR. SHAFFER: That is something kind of new, whether it was a direct deposit or a check.

CHAIRMAN: That is not appropriate at this time. Go ahead, Mr. Kane.

MR. KANE: So the theory that this was



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

somehow a bonus is contradicted by the offer memos, the promissory note itself, and it's contradicted by his own testimony where he admits that when he received this \$111,347 loan in January of '08, he didn't record that as income on his taxes. At that time, it wasn't taxable. It only became taxable when the forgiveness occurred and that was the taxable event. Because forgiveness is an income.

So the documents, you know, support the idea that his argument here is completely without merit. Then he argues, and this is where I really have to take some exception, then he argues in his issues that under California state labor law states that balloon payment demands for loans made to employees made at the time of termination are not allowed even if the employee has given his or her consent to such payments. And he cites Section 11.25 in the Barnhill case.

Well, first of all, the labor code doesn't say anything such thing that Mr. Shaffer has propounded throughout this hearing, nor does the Barnhill case.

Just so that we all are on the same page, I made sure that the panel has copies of the Barnhill case, and I don't think Mr. Shaffer ever read the Barnhill case. I don't think it says anything that he purports it to conclude that it says. I have a copy for him, three for



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

74

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

March 18, 2011

349

the panel. The panel can consider it.

But if you'll look at the second page of the Barnhill case on the left-hand side, what it's saying here, the principle --

MR. SHAFFER: Objection. This was never offered before.

CHAIRMAN: You opened it up by referring to the case.

MR. KANE: The principle question presented here is whether an employer has the right to set off an employee's debt against wages due -- due the employee upon the employee's discharge, whether it -- to do a setoff as a penalty.

But going to the right-hand side, this was an individual who was a bookkeeper for the company. And when the company discharged the person, Ms. Barnhill, this is on the right-hand column, on that date, there was a balance due on a promissory note that she had of \$475 plus interest, and she was owed two weeks' wages against that \$475. So when she went to pick up her check, she was given a stub of net 0 balance of what was owing on the note.

That's what they're talking about here. It says here, "Labor Code 201 provides in relevant part if an employer discharges the employee, the wages earned at



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

the time are due and payable immediately." Well, that's not what we have here. That's not even close to what we have here.

If you go to page 3 on the right-hand side, it says, "Unquestionably, when respondent was discharged, this is on the right-hand column before the footnotes, all the wages due her were immune from attachment." That's true. But that's not what we have here, either.

Then if you go to the page 4 on the left-hand side, it's merely saying here, this is before the penalty section, "Permitting appellant to reach respondent's wages by setoff would let it accomplish what neither it or any other contributor could do by attachment and would defeat the legislative policy underlined at exception.

We conclude that the employer is not entitled to a setoff of debts only to get -- by an employee against wages due that employee." That's what Barnhill says. It doesn't say balloon payments on loans aren't permissible.

It has nothing to do with the facts of this case. And he should have read the case. What he did is he looked at a manual and looked at excerpts and headnotes and he didn't bother to read the cases.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

He's made all kinds of accusations here against me, my firm and Wells Fargo regarding the enforceability of this note. Going further, there's another case where the Barnhill case was cited, and I think that's significant as well, because this relates to the issue of this issue unconscionability that he's raised. This is the Cole Vario case, another California case. And those are three for the panel. And the page --

CHAIRMAN: Has this case been mentioned before by you?

MR. KANE: It has not been mentioned. It's in response to his calling these contracts unconscionable and void. And this to refute that. This is a legal argument as part of my closing.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. You may proceed.

MR. KANE: So, basically, if you would go to the page that has 15 in the upper-right-hand corner, it was referencing the Barnhill case on the right-hand side where it distinguished Barnhill and said Barnhill doesn't apply to the setting that we have here.

And it went on to say at the bottom that referring to wages paid prohibits an employer only from collecting or receiving wages that have already been earned by performance of agreed-upon requirements. The



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

commissions here were not so earned.

And what it's doing is saying that application of Barnhill to this setting is just not appropriate. But more importantly, this case goes on, if you take a look on page 16 where it says no unconscionability -- and Mr. Shaffer has referred to these so-called sections in this promissory note is unconscionable and an adhesion contract.

Well, if you go to page 17, it provides -- and this is what the panel needs to look at. 16 started -- I'm sorry, where it says there is no unconscionability. And it goes on. And what I'm going to read is from page 17.

Unconscionability analysis begins with an inquiry into whether the contract is one of adhesion. It sites an issue. An issue which Vario points out is not a direct subject of any meaningful testimony. But then he defines unconscionability has both a procedural and substantive element.

The procedural element focuses on impression or surprise due to equal -- unequal bargaining power and substantive element overly harsh or one-sided results. Both elements must be present.

Here, as demonstrated, and here as well, set forth there was nothing surprising about the



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

commission plans and nothing oppressive. Well, there was nothing surprising about the loan that he was going to receive. There certainly wasn't anything oppressive about the loan.

He received \$111,000 use of that money for five years, not taxable when he first got it, and spread the tax consequences over five years. Thus, there is no unconscionability, likewise, no substantive unconscionability was described by the case.

Then it goes to the right-hand side. "The court concluded there was no unconscionability because plaintiff was aware of her obligations under the contract and voluntarily agreed to assume them.

Then, particularly opposite here, the court concluded there was no substantive unconscionability. Substantive unconscionability is shown only by contract terms. And that's certainly not what we have here.

And then it goes -- and so that's -there's no adhesion contract, no unconscionability. And
continuing along those lines, he continues to say that
this -- the problems in California, they have some
boilerplate language which is unenforceable. And he
cites a code on that.

That's certainly not the case in California. The case on that is the Federal Savings



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

versus Versaccio. I'll hand that up to the panel and give him a copy as well. It looks like I am one short. I only have two copies of this case. I apologize. But the case at page 8, and if you look at page 8, at the top --

CHAIRMAN: I'll make a copy.

MR. KANE: I apologize I'm short one copy.

Contract of adhesion is listed at the lower-right-hand corner. And, basically, what it says is California courts hold that as a matter of law, standardized promissory note forms into which the interest rate and other agreed upon terms are inserted such as the notes at issue here, are not unenforceable contracts of adhesion. It is pretty clear that what Mr. --

CHAIRMAN: Where was that?

MR. KANE: The page is 8 at the top. If you go down to the bottom on the right-hand side, the last paragraph, it says "contracts of adhesion". Under that heading.

MR. SHAFFER: On page 8?

MR. KANE: And the reference is at the lower-right-hand section. So it's pretty clear that a non-attorney has come in here and spewed forth things that are really not the law, and cast aspersions on



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

7.3

March 18, 2011

myself and my law firm, things he just really doesn't know about.

It's pretty clear, and that's why I had to go through to make sure all the cases were here to demonstrate that there's nothing unenforceable about these promissory notes under California law, factually or legally. And they must be enforced pursuant to California law.

Now I'm going to address the next issue that he has, and it's the next page. And it's wrongful termination. And once again, Mr. Shaffer is not an attorney, but he thinks he's one. And he's not and he's misstated what the California law is regarding termination.

It's I think important to note here that Mr. Shaffer wasn't terminated because he got production warnings. He wasn't terminated for low production.

Quite candidly, he could have been terminated for low production because he was an at-will employee. He could have been terminated for any reason. I'm going to give you the California law on that in a minute.

He wasn't terminated for low production, but for violating policy, which I'm going to get into in a minute. His own documents demonstrate that although he had production warnings from time to time, there are



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

also times when he met the criteria and he was taken off of the production warnings. Even Mr. Shaffer just a little while ago admitted that because of the production warnings, from time to time, there were also times when he met the criteria and he was taken off of the production warnings.

Even Mr. Shaffer a while ago said that because of the economic conditions in 2008, that in late 2008 and 2009, all firms, and firm-wide, they required that you meet 80 percent of the production goal. It wasn't anything that was directed toward him. It was firm-wide.

You saw in some of the rankings, he ranked pretty well in connection with the other agents. He wasn't terminated for his low production. I'll get into that further.

The clear reason that he was terminated was found in Exhibit 10. And in Exhibit 10, and I want to make sure the panel is very clear on this, the commission schedule that he should have charged these customers is reflected in Exhibit 10 at pages 23 and 26. That's the commission calculators.

And there's been a lot of questions about this -- the gray area and the maximum. If you do the math, the commission calculator generally follows when



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

you get to the 167 and the other figure, the FINRA rule and the FINRA guide, it used to be a rule. It's now a guide. That's the markup policy. It's a FINRA rule, and this is law. And I'll leave a copy with the panel. I'll give a copy to Mr. Shaffer. Here's three for the panel.

This is the markup policy. The old rule-of-thumb used to be can't -- I think I have enough of that one. The old rule of thumb used to be, and still is, you can't mark up a trade more than 5 percent of the principle.

As it indicates here, they made an interpretation to make sure that was deemed to be a guide, not a policy. But if you do the numbers, those maximum amounts that are in that gray area that has a systems issue which I think Ms. McClaskey saw, it demonstrates if we use that maximum number against that trade, you would be way, way outside of the 5 percent policy.

So the calculator was a guide that the brokers were supposed to follow. And it was on a system, unless they overrode the system, which he did, that would show what the correct commission was.

He overrode the system in order to charge more than the schedule that was permitted to be charged



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

under the schedule that Wells Fargo had in place in the system. There is no doubt about that. And there is no doubt about that, that he did it to adjust his revenue upward to meet these goals. He wasn't terminated for lack of meeting his goals.

It is not a justifiable reason for any broker to charge excess commissions to meet quotas or goals. That is a Cardinal sin. You are not then using -- keeping the best interest of the client in mind, you're keeping your own best interest in mind. That's prohibited. It was clearly in violation of this policy.

Then he exacerbates that when he writes this e-mail. "I thought gouging was part of our business plan." Can you imagine, poor Ms. Mortensen, as a compliance officer, seen a broker, knowing he's charged these excess commissions and getting an e-mail like this that gouging is part of the business plan.

She did what she was supposed to do, she ran it up the totem pole to the supervisors. Everybody gave this strong consideration. This was legal, compliant.

With all due respect, this e-mail in Exhibit 9 comes up. And, again, I want to -- I think there was some confusion about Exhibit 9. This



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

violation was not corrected. Just so we're clear, on September 11th -- it's true, it's a true on September 11th, 2009, he received a written complaint from a customer. There's just no two ways about it. The customer said "I will contact my attorney if you don't contact me. I'm pissed you got me into this." No question.

He responds to the customer on Monday,
September 14th. But that doesn't cure the violation.
He never gave this to his supervisors, and he was
required to do that.

And there's a reason why he was required to do that. There's nothing in this e-mail that says everything was corrected as of Monday, September 14th or that the customer is satisfied with his response and there is still the risk that this customer is going to have the attorney contact Wells Fargo. There's still the risk that this client is still, quote, unquote, pissed that you got me into this and might bring some action.

And the purpose of the rule is so the compliance department and legal department don't get surprised with things. If they need to, they can't take proactive action.

This violation was never corrected. His



Toll Free: 888,486,4044

March 18, 2011

failure to report to the supervisor that written complaint, and that's exactly what was required in the compliance manual that's in the exhibit -- Exhibit 11, that he affirmed he read in Exhibit 12.

So what we get to, then, so it's -- what we get to, then is the -- and I'll get to the Exhibit 8 in a minute. But Exhibit 8 is the U5, and that contains clear and accurate language. And I'm going to get into that in a minute.

Before he gets there, he next raises in his issues wrongful termination. It's still part of wrongful termination, that he's claiming that as a result of people thinking he had a bad attitude or these warnings, that he was constructively discharged, if you will, or wrongfully terminated instead of for the reasons stated here.

Well, again, the law in California is not what Mr. Shaffer would like it to be, but it's clear. In California, an employment relationship may generally be terminated by either party at-will. This means that unless they agree otherwise, either party may terminate the employer/employee relationship without cause.

The leading case in California citing the California labor code, Section 2922 is Stevenson versus Superior Court that says that exactly. And it's pretty



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

- 23

March 18, 2011

clear in the offer letters that were given to

Mr. Shaffer, he was an employee at at-will. It's pretty

clear in the private client services agreement,

Exhibit 4, that he was an employee at-will. They both

agreed to that. And it's pretty clear in the promissory

note that he was an employee at-will.

And the clause goes further. An at-will employee like Mr. Shaffer may be discharged for no reason or even for arbitrary or irrational reason.

But there is an exception: An at-will employee may not be terminated for an unlawful reason. If you ask an employee to commit a crime and he refuses to do that, you cannot dismiss an employee for that. Or a purpose that contravenes public policy. Those are the only two exceptions to the tort of a tortuous discharge in California.

That is Gant versus Pasebry Insurance, 824
Pacific 2d, 6A. To support a claim for tortuous
discharge, which is in essence what this is, the
violated policy must be supported by either a
Constitutional or statutory provision or be public in
the sense that it enures the benefit of the public
rather than serving an individual interest, and be
articulated at the time of discharge and be fundamental
and substantial.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

There's nothing like that that we have here. Absolutely nothing. So none of the exceptions to public policy or for statutory tortuous discharge are applicable to the facts of this case. He simply was not wrongfully terminated. As an at-will employee, he could have been terminated for any reason. But he was clearly terminated for just and appropriate reasons.

I'm going to get into that next because the facts have established that there was a very valid reason to terminate Mr. Shaffer. A firm simply cannot risk harm to its clients by somebody who, one, charges excess commissions over the schedule and then says it's part of a gouging business plan and fail to report customer complaints that might deprive the firm of knowing that there's a problem, a potential problem out there.

Those are appropriate reasons to terminate an employee, even though the firm didn't need one. He was terminated for just reasons.

Then we get to the issue of libel, his next issue, libel and slander. Well, I alluded to it yesterday, but I didn't get into all of it. The facts of the matter is that defamation or libel involves intentional publication of a statement of fact which is false, unprivileged and has a natural tendency to injure



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

or which causes special damages.

The case there is London versus Sears

Roebuck, Northern District of California, 619 F. Sub 2d,

854.

But the leading case is the Fontani case that I referenced yesterday. And that case, I'll give Mr. Shaffer a copy of the Fontani case. I do have an extra copy of that.

This is Fantoni versus Wells Fargo. It's a California case from 2005. And I'll just read the headnote. You can read the document. But the headnote on the right-hand side says, "Form submitted by employer to the National Association of Securities", which that used to be FINRA. I'm reading from the right-hand side that says "Cases". This is just a headnote. You can look at the body of your case.

Describing reasons for an employer's termination, a broker/dealer has a communication before a, quote, official proceeding supporting employer's motion to strike former employee's defamation and interference with prospective business advantage claims as a strategic lawsuit, not against public policy.

Although the record was silent as to whether the NAS actually investigated the employee based on the statements, the form was a communication made in



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

(·

anticipation of an official proceeding, and thus, within the last statute, which means it was absolutely privileged.

So if you go to -- so what this case stands for is the idea that -- and you can read it. It's the statute in California which made this an official preceding in anticipation of -- and that people can make statements in anticipation of an official proceeding and have an absolute privilege against a defamation claim. It's what the Fontani case stands for.

We cited that in our response to the counterclaim at pages 15 and 16 where California law extends an absolute privilege against defamation claims arising out of statements obtained in a Form U5 because a Form U5 is a communication made in anticipation of bringing an action or other official proceeding. And that's the Fontani case that we cite there.

And so first of all, the information contained, as you heard from Ms. Mortensen on the U5, I know the chair went into it in detail, is accurate information. Number one is accurate. It's not false, can't form the bases of a defamation claim because it's accurate.

It also can't form the basis of a



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

defamation claim because it's absolutely privileged. There's a reason for that. Employers have to not fear being candid with the regulators as to what happened and then be sued for it. As Ms. Mortensen said, it's a damned-if-you-do-and-damned-if-you-don't type situation. If you put something that's innocuous on this and a customer sues, I can tell you what happens in most cases to firms that do those types of things.

It's accurate, not defamatory and in no way -- as Ms. Mortensen testified, none of these discussions about the e-mail or the SS commissions have anything to do with his production. None of it.

It was because of the circumstances surrounding these two trades and the e-mail that he sent regarding gouging as part of the business plan.

Regarding the withholding of the disability benefits, we saw -- I took you through that, Met Life went to great pains to try and satisfy Mr. Shaffer. They had a department consultant come in and review.

The fact of the matter is it has nothing do with Wells Fargo. Its insurer did everything that it was supposed to do, and its insurer made the decision to deny him the benefits, not Wells Fargo.

As to this licensed banker program commissions, you heard that. Nothing unusual about



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

that. If a licensed banker referred him business, it when into a joint rep code and it was split 50/50. It happens all the time and it's not the basis of any claim that can be made here. Nor could he quantify. If anything, he said it was a very insignificant dollar amount. So it really is not a factor here.

Then he made this claim of promissory estoppel. We responded to that in page 17 of our response to the counterclaim. Promissory estoppel is an equitable doctrine to allow enforcement of a promise that would otherwise be unenforceable.

In order to prevail on a cause of action for promissory estoppel, Mr. Shaffer had to prove there was a promise that was clear and unambiguous in a promise that was made, and he relied on it. And in his reliance, he was injured. This refers to the e-mail where one person was on medical leave and Ms. Krug says, "You can cover that. It's going to be business as usual."

Well, that's no promise that he's going to continue that forever. In fact, we know what happened after that e-mail was the trade commission issue came up. So there's no promissory estoppel here.

So as it relates to this, none of his claims have -- in our view, have been factually correct.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

But also insignificantly, they're legally without merit. They can't be valid because it would be against the law.

They are all invalid despite Mr. Shaffer's stating what is law when it really isn't. He's not an attorney. I understand that.

But then we get to the next claim of damages. And the law in California is also clear on that. First of all, there are no damages if Wells Fargo committed no wrongdoing. So Wells Fargo did nothing wrong here.

He has not been able to establish any of these claims. And accordingly, we don't even get to the issue of damages. In the event the panel wants to think about that at all, though, damages may not be based on sheer speculation or surmise and the mere possibility or even probability that damage will result from wrongful conduct does not render it actionable. That's the Ferguson case of 30 Cal. Commission 4th, 1037.

And there's also the Garion versus Chapman University case at 121 Cal. Commission Ap. 4353, which says, "Whatever the proper measure of damages may be in a given case, the recovery therefore is still subject to the fundamental rule that damages which are speculative, remote, imaginary, contingent or merely possible cannot serve as a legal basis for recovery."



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

In this case, he wanted to take the ten-year average that has all kinds of market fluctuations and moves in between. That's not the type of thing that he can just come in and say that a ten-year average can be applied going forward for the next X years that I'm in. That requires an analysis that was not done here.

What we did see is that, quite candidly, Mr. Shaffer's business was in decline before he came to Wells Fargo. In 2005, the last year that he was at H & R Block before he came over to Wells Fargo, his earnings were \$56,000. Clearly, on his own calculations, he made more than that on an average, \$78,000 at Wells Fargo. It just goes to show the speculative nature of this thing.

Moreover, we know what the market conditions were in 2008 versus the other areas that he wants to compare. Quite candidly, the damages analysis that he presented is just not appropriate. It's just based on conjecture and speculation and is not probative of any issue of damages.

It's been somewhat of a difficult case for me. I've tried to be patient because I understand Mr. Shaffer is not an attorney. But my personal reputation, my firm's reputation has been challenged by



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

1.3

March 18, 2011

him at every -- Ms. Mortensen's reputation has been challenged, and it's been difficult for me to be patient. And the panel has been very gracious in that regard.

What he's done here is just wrong. What he's done is tried to throw as much mud against the wall against as many people as he could. And what I've had to do with all of this is start scraping the mud away, just scraping the mud away. And I have stripped the mud away. And the wall is clean.

Wells Fargo did not do anything wrong as it relates to Mr. Shaffer. As unfortunate as his situation might be, as unfortunate as the discharge might be, that's the result of his own conduct, not the wrongful conduct of me, not the wrongful conduct of my firm, not the wrongful conduct of Ms. Mortensen, not the wrongful conduct of Wells Fargo. It's the results of his own actions that has consequences.

However, he doesn't want to accept the consequences. I understand that. He doesn't want to accept the consequences of his own actions. But factually and legally, his claims are without merit.

And really, as a matter of law, pursuant to the clear language of the promissory note, those claims must be enforced according to the contractual terms.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

And pursuant to the law in California and the facts that developed, all of his counterclaims must be dismissed with prejudice, and this panel should award Wells Fargo exactly what it asked for in Claimant's Exhibit 16, and that is the unpaid principle and accrued interest on the promissory note that would be \$74,617.76. This is all in Tab 16, plus the accrued interest of \$3,367.20 for \$77,984.96, plus the \$29,814 in attorney's fees as I explained what that was to the panel, and \$8,862.06 in costs.

Because that's provided for in the agreement and because as I cited the case to you, and I can site it again, the reason we're able to get attorney's fees for defending the counterclaim, and that's the Soligo versus Castelluci, 21 Cal. App. 4th, 873, 26 Cal Reporter 2d 439. That's a Sixth District case, 1994.

So the total we would ask for is \$116,661.05.

These promissory notes, as Mr. Shaffer himself has acknowledged are common in the industry. He had one at Morgan Stanley for \$180,000. It's important to the industry that brokers be required to honor the written agreements that they sign when they accept these kinds of benefits. It certainly sends the wrong message



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

in the industry to not do that. So, again, we only ask that you require him to do what he agreed to do.

I do again thank the panel for its time and its patience.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kane.

The panel will confer and may require several days. But the decision will be forwarded to the parties after it is sent to FINRA and to counsel, of course.

In order to expedite delivery of the panel's decision to the parties, the panel may either execute a handwritten copy of the award or each Arbitrator may execute a counterpart copy of the award.

As I failed to mention at the beginning of the case, FINRA is asking each party and counsel to complete an evaluation of this arbitration. That participation, which of course is voluntary, assists FINRA's operation and ongoing effort to improve the arbitration process.

You can find the evaluation form at www.finra.org/arbevaluation. And, actually, you can Google FINRA and get their home page, and you can pick out parts that are applicable and download an evaluation form. If you do not have internet access or have difficulty completing the evaluation online, you can ask



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

your case administrator, who in this has turned out to be Joanna Lamb, to provide a paper version of the evaluation. And so FINRA does request that you do that.

Mr. Kane referred to certain documents that were confidential and I request that they be returned. And these documents were, as I understand it, in the hands of Mr. Shaffer. Are there any such documents now in the hands of the panel?

MR. KANE: No. I don't believe there are any documents in the hands of the panel that have been marked confidential. I think it's mainly the compensation plans.

CHAIRMAN: So the panel has been asked to request Mr. Shaffer to return them. As I understand it, Mr. Shaffer does not have a problem returning those confidential documents which Wells Fargo marked as confidential and records as proprietary.

And do take all the stuff here that you have brought in. I don't know what would happen to it when we're through. So if there's anything that you really want to retain, make sure that you secure control over it.

The record will remain open until the panel arrives at a decision and the panel determines that the hearing is closed.



Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

No party will contact any member of the arbitration panel directly. All communications, you recall, have to be directed to the staff person at FINRA and then sorted out from there. So we're going to pack up and confer perhaps a little bit tonight, not much, and we have made arrangements to confer over the next day or so.

Thank you very much. I appreciate it. And speaking on behalf of the panel, we appreciate the civility and respect that all of the personnel, counsel, witnesses, have provided each other and us during the course of this. This is the way these things should operate and it gives testimony contra to some of the horror stories one hears about these proceedings. So thank you very much. We appreciate your cooperation.

Off the record.

ESQUIRE AD A Lexander Gallin Company

Toll Free: 888.486.4044

March 18, 2011

374

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2

1

4 | 5 | Re 6 | Wi 7 | th 8 | fe 9 | te 10 | my 11 | my

14 15

12

13

17 18

16

19

20

21

2223

24

25

I, Celena D. Moulton, Registered Professional
Reporter and Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public
within and for the State of Missouri do hereby certify
that the witness whose testimony appears in the
foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the
testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of
my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under
my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to,
nor employed by any of the parties of the action in
which this deposition was taken, and further, that I am
not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel
employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or
otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

CELEÑA D. MOULTON, RPR, CCR

License No. 700

Notary Public, within and for the State of Missouri

My Commission expires September 9, 2014.

Toll Free: 888.486.4044